



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/763,194	02/20/2001	Kazunobu Fujikawa	Q63075	3832
<div>7590 09/01/2009</div> <div>SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20037</div>				
EXAMINER				
ELVE, MARIA ALEXANDRA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3742				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/01/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/763,194

Applicant(s)

FUJIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

M. Alexandra Elve

Art Unit

3742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 8-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 8-10 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/18/09
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 & 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue (USPN 4,448,655) in view of Rocklin (USPN 4,551,603) or in the alternative in view of Inoue (USPN 4,346,281).

Inoue ('655) discloses:

An improved electrode and method for electroerosion machining ... The elongated element is formed with a rugged peripheral surface along a length ... Various ways of producing the rugged peripheral surface are described, e.g. by forming projections and recesses in a regular pattern on a cylindrical wire surface; twisting together a group of small diameter wires; winding a small diameter wire on a large diameter core wire; and forming a spiral groove in the smooth surface of a wire by means of a rotating die. (abstract)

Customarily, the wire electrode is constituted as a single wire having a diameter of 0.05 to 0.5 mm and composed of copper metal or a copper alloy such as brass. (col. 1, lines 54-57)

It is well known that copper and brass are ductile metals/alloys.

... a traveling-wire electroerosion-machining electrode which consists of an elongated element having ... a rugged peripheral surface along a length thereof or its peripheral surface having surface projections and recesses formed on the said surface and arranged in a predetermined uniform pattern. The projections or recesses should have a height or depth one fiftieth to one third, preferably one thirtieth to one fifth and more preferably

one tenth to one fifth, of the thickness of the elongated element, or in the range preferably between 5 and 20 microns.

... The rugged peripheral surface may be produced by constituting the elongated element with a plurality of conductive wires twisted together, or interlaced or braided to provide a predetermined uniform pattern of surface projections and recesses. An essentially equivalent rugged peripheral electrode surface may be produced by twisting one or more relatively thin conductive wires on a relatively thick conductive wire or on a bundle of thin conductive wires, or by covering a relatively thick conductive wire or a bundle of thin wires with a weave of relatively thin conductive wires.

Figure 3 shows a spiral wire electrode.

... The rugged peripheral surface may alternatively be produced by forming projections and recesses on a conventional traveling-wire machining electrode wire by means of a mechanical, electrochemical or thermal technique or any combination thereof. The mechanical forming technique includes sandblasting and knurling. Sandblasting may make use of grit having a mesh size of 10 to 500. In knurling, the recess diameter is determined by the size and number per unit area of the projections on the knurling tool. A rotary die may also be used to mechanically form a rugged peripheral surface on the conventional electrode wire by drawing the latter through the die. Chemical forming includes electroless plating and etching while electrochemical forming includes electroplating and electroetching. Thermal forming may be practiced by plasma-spraying of fine metallic powder particles. Powder atomizing may also be used to provide a rugged peripheral surface on the conventional electrode wire by applying atomized powder particles thereon. (col. 2, lines 40-68 & col. 3, lines 6-13)

...A traveling-wire machining electrode E which is here constructed of any one of the novel elongated elements shown in FIGS. 2-10 or a modification thereof and having a thickness 0.05 to 0.5 mm, preferably 0.09 to 0.5 mm is stored in a supply reel 5 mounted at an upper site... (col. 5, lines 27-32)

The cross tables 12 and 13 carrying the work stand 11 are driven in an X-Y plane, by means of an X-axis motor 38 and a Y-axis motor 39 drivingly coupled therewith, respectively. The motor 38 and 39 are energized with X-axis and Y-axis drive signals

furnished from a numerical-control (NC) unit 40 to displace the workpiece W relative to the longitudinal axis of the wire electrode E to establish a given relative machining-start position preprogrammed in the NC unit 40 and then to displace the workpiece W relative to the axis of the traveling wire electrode E along a prescribed cutting path also preprogrammed in the NC unit 40. (col. 6, lines 31-42)

... In addition, advantageously the outer recesses 53 and inner recesses 54 both provide pockets for the machining liquid which serves as a coolant on one hand and as a machining medium on the other thus permitting the electrode surfaces to be cooled with increased efficiency and enabling delivery of the machining liquid into the machining gap with consistency and without fail... (col. 6, lines 65-68 & col. 7, lines 1-5)

Inoue ('655) discloses a ductile (copper, copper alloy or brass) wire electrode having projections and recesses. In addition the recesses may be used to carry dielectric fluid. Inoue does not specifically teach surface discharge material adhered to the worksurface.

Rocklin discloses a spark discharge apparatus in which metal from the electrode is deposited onto the worksurface. The electrode may be constructed on many types of materials and alloys. Copper and brass are some of the materials used. The electrode may be constructed from an intermetallic phase dispersed in a matrix of eutectic or solid solution.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a ductile wire (ductile electrode) constructed of a combination of materials to deposit (reform) the worksurface, as taught by Rocklin in the Inoue ('655) apparatus because it is merely a variation of the electrode.

OR in the alternative:

Inoue ('281) discloses a surface discharge apparatus in which the metal electrode is a composite (figure 3 & 4). The electrode may be made of WC-Co and copper. This electrode forms metallic alloy deposition on the worksurface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a composite electrode as taught by Inoue ('281) in the Inoue ('655) apparatus because it is merely a variation of the electrode.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue ('655) and Rocklin, as stated above and further in view of Bonga (USPN 4,645,894).

Inoue ('655) does not teach a wire feeder with multiple wire spools.

Bonga discloses:

An EDM electrode wire changer has a plurality of conduits, one for each available electrode wire, all conduits converging towards the threading axis of a selected electrode wire through the workpiece or, alternatively, disposed substantially parallel on a slide that is indexable such as to dispose the outlet of a selected one of the conduits in alignment with the threading axis.... (abstract)

It is even sometimes necessary to use electrode wires of different compositions. For example, if it is desired to obtain very fine details, it is advantageous to use a molybdenum electrode wire, rather than a more conventional bronze or copper electrode wire, as molybdenum is a metal having very high strength under traction which thus permits to adopt an electrode wire of very small diameter. (col. 1, lines 29-36)

...The electrode wire feed mechanism mounted on the plate 4 comprises a wire supply spool 5 supplying the electrode wire 1 around a pulley or roller 6 driven by an electric motor 7 ... during normal machining... (col. 2, lines 48-51)

Each wire 1A through 1E is obtained from an individual supply spool, 5A through 5E. ... (col. 5, lines 2-21)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a multiple spool wire electrode source and a wire feeder as taught by Bonga in the Inoue ('655) apparatus because it allows rapid wire change for specific manufacturing conditions and thus decreases fabrication time. Furthermore, duplication of parts was held to have been obvious. In re Harza 124 USPQ 378.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inoue ('655) and Inoue ('281), as stated above and further in view of Bonga (USPN 4,645,894).

Inoue ('655) does not teach a wire feeder with multiple wire spools.

Bonga discloses:

An EDM electrode wire changer has a plurality of conduits, one for each available electrode wire, all conduits converging towards the threading axis of a selected electrode wire through the workpiece or, alternatively, disposed substantially parallel on a slide that is indexable such as to dispose the outlet of a selected one of the conduits in alignment with the threading axis.... (abstract)

It is even sometimes necessary to use electrode wires of different compositions. For example, if it is desired to obtain very fine details, it is advantageous to use a molybdenum electrode wire, rather than a more conventional bronze or copper electrode wire, as molybdenum is a metal having very high strength under traction which thus permits to adopt an electrode wire of very small diameter. (col. 1, lines 29-36)

...The electrode wire feed mechanism mounted on the plate 4 comprises a wire supply spool 5 supplying the electrode wire 1

around a pulley or roller 6 driven by an electric motor 7 ...
during normal machining... (col. 2, lines 48-51)

Each wire 1A through 1E is obtained from an individual supply
spool, 5A through 5E. ... (col. 5, lines 2-21)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a multiple spool wire electrode source and a wire feeder as taught by Bonga in the Inoue ('655) apparatus because it allows rapid wire change for specific manufacturing conditions and thus decreases fabrication time. Furthermore, duplication of parts was held to have been obvious. In re Harza 124 USPQ 378.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/4/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the rejection of claim 6 & 10 and references Bonga and Scarpelli. The examiner respectfully notes that Scarpelli has not been use and Bonga is directed to claim 10 alone.

Applicant argues that the prior art does not teach a recess and deposition on the workpiece. The examiner respectfully notes that the recess claim limitation is in combination with deposition on the wire.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Alexandra Elve whose telephone number is 571-272-1173. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-4:00 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tu B. Hoang can be reached on 571-272-4780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 30, 2009.

/M. Alexandra Elve/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3742